



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/823,928	03/31/2001	John T. Orchard	15685P096	7550
43831	7590	05/06/2005	EXAMINER	
BERKELEY LAW & TECHNOLOGY GROUP 5250 NE ELAM YOUNG PARKWAY SUITE 850 HILLSBORO, OR 97124			NGO, CHUONG D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2193	

DATE MAILED: 05/06/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

47

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/823,928

Applicant(s)

ORCHARD, JOHN T.

Examiner

Chuong D. Ngo

Art Unit

2193

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4-17 and 19-31 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2,4-17 and 19-31 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 2,4-17, and 19-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Grisamore (6,535,901).

As per claims 2,11,12,14-17,26,27 and 29-31, Grisamore discloses in figures 5 and 9 a method for implementing a Wallace-architecture in which full-adders (3-dot circle) and half adders (2-dot circle) are selected and their numbers are clearly depend on a bit-wise analysis of the input terms within each level of bit-significance. It is noted that Grisamore does not teach registers in figures 5 and 9. However, Grisamore discloses that it is known in the art to use registers at optimal points in a multiplier to enable pipelined processing which provides a high through put multiply accumulate circuit. Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provides the Wallace-architecture of Grisamore with registers at optimal points in the architecture to enable pipelined processing in order increase the through put of circuit.

As per claims 4,13,19-25 and 28, since it is well know in the art to implement a multiplier by a FPGA (see the cited references), It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, as a matter of design choice, to implement the multiplier by a FPGA as claimed.

2. Claims 2,4-17 and 19-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Costa et al. (5,935,201).

As per claims 2,11,12,14-17,26,27 and 29-31, Costa et al. discloses in figures 7-9 a Wallace-architecture in which full-adders (3-input block) and half adders (2-input block) are

Art Unit: 2193

selected and their numbers are clearly depend on a bit-wise analysis of the input terms within each level of bit-significance. It is noted that Costa et al does not teach registers in the Wallace-architecture. However, since it is known in the art to use registers at optimal points in a multiplier to enable pipelined processing which provides a high through put multiply circuit (See col. 1, lines 33-41). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provides the Wallace-architecture of Costa et al. with registers at optimal points in the architecture to enable pipelined processing in order increase the through put of circuit.

As per claims 4,13,19-25 and 28, since it is well know in the art to implement a multiplier by a FPGA (see the cited references), It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, as a matter of design choice, to implement the multiplier by a FPGA as claimed.

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 02/22/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

It is not agreed to applicant's argument that the examiner has provided no suggestion or motivation to modify Grisamore. In the rejection, the examiner has provided clear rationale and motivation to modify Grisamore. In particular, Grisamore discloses that it is known in the art to use registers at optimal points in a multiplier to enable pipelined processing which provides a high through put multiply accumulate circuit. Thus it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to provides the Wallace-architecture of Grisamore with registers at optimal points in the architecture to enable pipelined processing in order increase the through put of circuit. (See Grisamore, col. 1, lines 33-41).

It is also not agreed to applicant's arguments that neither Grisamore nor Costa discloses bit-wise analysis of input terms. It is clearly from figure 5 of Grisamore and figure 8 of Costa that full-adders (FAs) and half adders (HAs) and their numbers are selected clearly depending on a bit-wise analysis of the input terms within each level of bit-significance. For instance, in figure 5 of Grisamore the number of full-adders and half adders in each column (level of bit-significance) is not arbitrary, but are differently selected for each column depending on the number of product terms in that column. For example in figure 5 of Grisamore, there is a HA in column 1 having three product terms, a HA and a FA in column 2 having four product terms, and a HA and two FAs in column 3 having 5 product terms, etc. Changing the number of product terms in a column would clearly change the numbers of FA and HA in that column. The statement in Grisamore that "the process then continues by determining number of, and configuration of, full adders and half adders required for a reduction function of the current partial products based on the one of the plurality of reduction patterns and the size of the current partial products" is a general teaching. It should be noted that the required total numbers of full adders an half adders are depend on the numbers of full adders an half adders in each column (level of bit-significance), and the size of the current partial products is depend on the number of product terms in each column. Figure 5 of Grisamore discloses in details the circuit design in which full-adders (FAs) and half adders (HAs) are selected and their numbers for each column (level of bit-significance) are clearly depend on the number of product terms in that column, and that clearly requires a bit-wise analysis of the input terms within each level of bit-significance (column) as claimed.

Art Unit: 2193

4. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the application prior to the entry of the submission under 37 CFR 1.114 and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the application prior to entry under 37 CFR 1.114. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL** even though it is a first action after the filing of a request for continued examination and the submission under 37 CFR 1.114. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chuong D. Ngo whose telephone number is (571) 272-3731. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday.

Art Unit: 2193

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kakali Chaki can be reached on (571) 272-3719. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Chuong D Ngo
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2193

04/29/2005